PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Masaaki HORI et al.

Group Art Unit: 2861

Application No.: 10/671,457

Examiner: T. NGUYEN

Filed: September 29, 2003

Docket No.: 117241

For: ELECTRONIC DEVICE INCLUDING MECHANICAL MODULE AND METHOD FOR OBTAINING ALTERNATIVE CHARACTERISTIC VALUES FOR THE DEVICE

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the September 30, 2005 Office Action, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 and 6 of co-pending U.S. Patent 10/671,832.

When rejected claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner must properly define the subject matter of the claims that issue and the differences between those claims and the claims in the applied reference. Furthermore, according to MPEP §804, when making an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, the Examiner should make clear: (a) the differences between the inventions define the by the conflicting claims; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claims has issued is an obvious variation of the